REMARKS

The applicants have carefully considered the Office action dated February 24, 2006. Claims 28 to 40 are pending and at issue. Of the claims at issue, claims 28 and 36 are independent. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office action rejects claims 28-40 as unpatentable over Gordon et al. (US Pub. No. 2001/0056577), hereinafter referred to as Gordon A, in view of Gordon et al. (US 6,208,335), hereinafter referred to as Gordon B.

Claim 28 recites, *inter alia*, a method comprising adding conditional logic to channel objects that include more than one channel definition, the conditional logic including one or more rules that must be evaluated by a receiver to identify a first channel definition or a second channel definition.

Gordon A is directed to a data structure and methods for providing an interactive program guide. The Office action contends that bitmaps described by Gordon A are channel objects, a point which the applicant does not admit. However, the Office action admits that Gordon A does not disclose "that one or more rule[s] could or should be included in a channel object, i.e., bitmaps." (Page 4, ¶ 1).

The Office action seeks to cure the deficiencies of Gordon A by citing Gordon B. Gordon B describes a method and apparatus for providing a menu structure for an interactive information distribution system. The Office action contends that Col. 7, lines 40-65+ of Gordon B describes that one or more rules are included in a channel object. (Page 4, ¶ 2). The cited portions of Gordon B describe that graphical objects are associated with applets. The applicant respectfully submits that the cited portion of Gordon B does not describe or suggest that applets are rules.

13

Further, even if the applets of Gordon B could be considered rules, which the applicant certainly does not admit or suggest, the cited portion of Gordon B does not describe or suggest that the applets must be evaluated by a receiver to identify a first channel definition or a second channel definition, as recited by claim 28. Gordon B illustrates the properties of an applet in FIG. 5, which is described in Col. 13, line 42 to Col. 14, line 5. The applets of Gordon B contain a leader, OSD overlays, navigation control instructions, and MPEG video. Gordon B does not describe or suggest that any of the applet components are rules, much less that any of the applet components are rules that must be evaluated by a receiver to identify a first channel definition or a second channel definition.

Still further, even if the applets of Gordon B could properly be considered rules that must be evaluated by a receiver to identify a first channel definition or a second channel definition, it is not clear how the applets of Gordon B could be included with conditional logic that is added to channel objects, which the examiner contends are described by Gordon A. In particular, as noted above, the examiner contends that the bitmaps of Gordon A are channel objects. (Office action, page 3, full ¶ 2 and page 4, ¶ 1). Neither Gordon A nor Gordon B describes or suggests that the applets of Gordon B could be added to the bitmaps of Gordon A. In other words, no combination of Gordon A and Gordon B can describe or suggest adding conditional logic to channel objects that include more than one channel definition, the conditional logic including one or more rules that must be evaluated by a receiver to identify a first channel definition or a second channel definition.

For at least the forgoing reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 28 and all claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

14

Similar to claim 28, independent claim 37 recites a system comprising a

receiver for receiving television content including channel objects with more than one

channel definition including conditional logic having one or more rules including

conditions that must be evaluated to identify an appropriate channel definition. Claim

37 recites that the system further comprises a controller to evaluate conditions in one

or more rules of a channel object associated with a selected television channel and to

identify a first channel definition or a second channel definition for that television

channel. As previously stated, no combination of Gordon A and Gordon B can

describe or suggest channel objects including rules including one or more conditions

that must be evaluated to identify an appropriate channel definition, nor a controller to

evaluate the conditions of such rules. For at least the forgoing reasons, claim 37 and

all claims depending therefrom are patentable and are in condition for allowance.

If there is any matter that the examiner would like to discuss, the examiner

should feel free to contact the undersigned,

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 21, 2006

Georgeann S. Grunebach
Reg. No. 33,719
Attorney for Applicants

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.
RE / R08 / A109
P.O. Box 956
2230 E. Imperial Highway
El Segundo, CA 90245-0956

Phone (310) 964-4615